

ENGINEER'S REPORT

Prepared for the

CITY OF SAN DIEGO

**Stonecrest Village
Maintenance Assessment District**

Fiscal Year 2003

under the provisions of the

**San Diego Maintenance Assessment District Ordinance
of the San Diego Municipal Code**

and

**Landscape and Lighting Act of 1972
of the California Streets and Highways Code**

Prepared by

**BOYLE ENGINEERING CORPORATION
7807 Convoy Court, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92111
(858) 268-8080**

May 2002

CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Mayor

Dick Murphy

City Council Members

Scott Peters

District 1

Brian Maienschein

District 5

Byron Wear

District 2

Donna Frye

District 6

Toni Atkins

District 3

Jim Madaffer

District 7

George Stevens

District 4

Ralph Inzunza, Jr.

District 8

City Manager

Michael T. Uberuaga

City Attorney

Casey Gwinn

City Clerk

Charles G. Abdelnour

City Engineer

Frank Belock

Assessment Engineer

Boyle Engineering Corporation

Table of Contents

Engineer's Report

Stonecrest Village Maintenance Assessment District

Preamble	1
Executive Summary	2
Background	3
Stonecrest Village Development	3
Maintenance Assessment District	3
District Proceedings for Fiscal Year 2003	4
Bond Declaration	5
District Boundary	5
Project Description	5
Separation of General and Special Benefits	6
Cost Estimate	6
Annual Cost Indexing	6
Future Subdivision & Development Phasing	7
Method of Apportionment	8
Estimated Benefit of the Improvements	9
Planning Area Factor	9
Land Use Factor	9
Sample Assessment Calculations	10
Summary Results	12

EXHIBITS

Exhibit A: Boundary Map & Assessment Diagram

Exhibit B: Estimated Annual Expenses, Revenues & Reserves

Exhibit C: Assessment Roll

Engineer's Report Stonecrest Village Maintenance Assessment District

Preamble

Pursuant to the provisions of the "San Diego Maintenance Assessment District Ordinance" (being Division 2, Article 5, Chapter VI beginning at Section 65.0201 of the San Diego Municipal Code), provisions of the "Landscape and Lighting Act of 1972" (being Part 2 of Division 15 of the California Streets and Highways Code), applicable provisions of "Proposition 218" (being Article XIID of the California Constitution), and provisions of the "Proposition 218 Omnibus Implementation Act" (being California Senate Bill 919) (the aforementioned provisions are hereinafter referred to collectively as "Assessment Law"), in connection with the proceedings for the STONECREST VILLAGE MAINTENANCE ASSESSMENT DISTRICT (hereinafter referred to as "District"), BOYLE ENGINEERING CORPORATION, as Assessment Engineer to the City of San Diego for these proceedings, submits herewith this report for the District as required by California Streets and Highways Code Section 22565.

FINAL APPROVAL, BY RESOLUTION NO. _____,
ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN
DIEGO, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, ON THE
_____ DAY OF _____, 2002.

Charles G. Abdelnour, CITY CLERK
CITY OF SAN DIEGO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Executive Summary

Project: Stonecrest Village
Maintenance Assessment District

Apportionment Method: Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU)

	<u>FY 2002</u>	<u>FY 2003</u> ⁽¹⁾	Maximum ⁽²⁾ <u>Authorized</u>
Total Parcels Assessed:	592	592	--
Total Estimated Assessment:	\$252,099	\$252,099	\$341,350
Total Number of EDUs:	1,689.65	1,689.65	--
Assessment per EDU:	\$149.20	\$149.20	\$402.39

⁽¹⁾ FY 2003 is the City's Fiscal Year 2003, which begins July 1, 2002 and ends June 30, 2003. Total Parcels Assessed, Total Estimated Assessment, and Total Number of EDUs may vary from prior fiscal year values due to parcel changes and/or land use re-classifications.

⁽²⁾ Maximum Authorized annual amounts subject to cost indexing provisions set forth in this Engineers Report.

Proposition 218 Compliance: The District was engineered in Fiscal Year 1998 in compliance with Proposition 218. By a ballot proceeding, the single property owner unanimously approved Fiscal Year 1998 assessments, maximum authorized assessments for subsequent years, and provisions for annual cost indexing.

Annual Cost Indexing: An increase of assessments, under authority of annual cost indexing provisions, is **not** required for Fiscal Year 2003.

Bonds: No bonds will be issued in connection with this District.

Background

Stonecrest Village Development

The Stonecrest Specific Plan (adopted in 1988) proposed development of 318 acres located in the Kearny Mesa Planning Area for office, light industrial, and hotel uses. In 1993, the plan was amended to allow commercial/retail use within the northeastern portion and a golf driving range (under a conditional use permit). Development of these areas has been implemented. The plan was again amended in January 1996 to allow residential development on a 186.1-acre portion of the project with a maximum of 1,235 attached and detached residential dwelling units.

In March 1996, Tentative Map 95-0204 was approved. The development plan and map allow for 76.5 acres of attached and detached residential dwellings in 11 planning areas or lots, 97.1 acres of open space, and a balance of 12.5 acres of major streets dedicated to the public. Final Subdivision Map Number 13348 for Phase I was approved in August 1996.

Maintenance Assessment District

At the request of the developer, enhanced streetscape and landscape improvements (above standard development requirements) were constructed throughout the development. The development includes: extra wide parkways, planted medians, mid-block streetlights, community entry monuments, etc.

The City of San Diego (City) conditionally approved of Tentative Map 95-0204 (contained in Resolution Number R-286862), and set terms in an agreement (contained in Resolution Number R-287761 adopted on August 6, 1996) that required the developer to enter into a bonded maintenance agreement, assuring maintenance of all landscaping and appurtenances within the City right-of-way, until such time when a landscape maintenance district, property owners association, or other such mechanism is established for maintenance of all landscaping and appurtenances.

The developer was responsible for the construction and installation of

all landscape, lighting, and appurtenances and for the maintenance of all landscaping for a two-year establishment period beginning from the date of acceptance by the City's Park and Recreation Department. At the end of the two-year establishment period, the landscape maintenance shall be turned over to the Stonecrest Village Maintenance Assessment District (District).

California Pacific Homes (original owner of 100% of the parcels within the District boundary) petitioned the City to form the District on May 24, 1996. The City retained Boyle Engineering Corporation (Boyle) to prepare an Engineer's Report for the formation of the District. The District was engineered in Fiscal Year 1998 in compliance with Proposition 218. By a unanimous, single property owner vote, District was approved.

The Engineer's Report, preliminarily accepted by Resolution Number **R-288402 on March 4, 1998**, proposed Fiscal Year 1998 assessments, maximum authorized assessments for subsequent years, and provisions for annual cost indexing of the maximum authorized assessments.

District Proceedings for Fiscal Year 2003

This District is authorized and administered under the provisions of the "San Diego Maintenance Assessment District Ordinance" (being Division 2, Article 5, Chapter VI beginning at Section 65.0201 of the San Diego Municipal Code), provisions of the "Landscape and Lighting Act of 1972" (being Part 2 of Division 15 of the California Streets and Highways Code), applicable provisions of "Proposition 218" (being Article XIID of the California Constitution), and provisions of the "Proposition 218 Omnibus Implementation Act" (being California Senate Bill 919) (the aforementioned provisions are hereinafter referred to collectively as "Assessment Law"). This report has been prepared in compliance with Assessment Law.

The Fiscal Year **2003** assessments proposed within this Engineer's Report do **not** represent an increase over those assessments previously approved by property owners. Therefore, the vote requirements of Section 4 of Article XIID do **not** apply to these proceedings.

A public hearing will be scheduled where public testimony will be heard by the Council, and the Council may, at its discretion, adopt a resolution ordering the levying of the proposed assessments.

Bond Declaration

No bonds will be issued in connection with this District.

District Boundary

The Boundary Map & Assessment Diagram for the District are on file in the Maintenance Assessment Districts section of the Park and Recreation Department of the City of San Diego and by reference are made a part of this report. The Boundary Map and Assessment Diagram for the District are available for public inspection during normal business hours. A reduced copy of the Boundary Map is included as Exhibit A.

Project Description

The project consists of landscape maintenance and lighting associated with the Stonecrest Village residential development. Figure 1 provides a map of the areas and a description of the elements to be maintained. All improvements and lighting to be maintained fall within the dedicated public right-of-way, open space areas, or landscape easements dedicated to the City.

Due to the phasing of development and the requisite two-year establishment period, maintenance areas will be turned over to the District over a period of several years. The maintenance tasks associated with each area can be found in the legend on Figure 1. The project at ultimate buildout will include maintenance and energy costs associated with the following areas:

A. Medians	0.72 acres
B. Parkways	2.36 acres
C. Paseo	n/a
D. Riparian Trail	0.75 acres
E. Open Space	61.7 acres
F. Slopes	19.7 acres
G. Streetscapes	0.2 acres
H. Project Entries	0.67 acres
I. Streetlights	14 poles/28 lights

The two open space/recreational areas (Lots A & B), and the two associated Paseos (shown on Figure 1) will be maintained by the homeowners association and are not a part of this District.

The engineering drawings for the improvements to be maintained by the District are on file at Map Records in the City Engineer's office and are incorporated herein by reference. The specifications for maintenance to be performed are contained in the City Contract Number L4195/01 which is incorporated herein by reference and are on file with the City Clerk and the Park and Recreation Department. The specifications for the maintenance are available for public inspection during normal business hours.

Separation of General and Special Benefits

Consistent with City policy for the public at large, the City will provide the District with annual contributions from the Gas Tax Fund for median maintenance (~~18.0¢~~ per square foot of landscaped median and ~~1.3¢~~ per square foot of hardscaped median) and from the Environmental Growth Fund for open space maintenance (~~\$26.63~~ per acre). These allocations are considered to be a "general benefit" administered by the District. All other maintenance, operation, and administrative costs, which exceed the City's contribution to the public at large, are "special benefits" funded by District.

Cost Estimate

Due to phasing of development and the two-year establishment period, costs incurred by the District are anticipated to escalate in three or four distinct incremental steps over the period from Fiscal Year 1998 to Fiscal Year 2005. The estimated cost at ultimate buildout served as the basis for the maximum estimated assessment. Estimated Fiscal Year ~~2003~~ annual expenses, revenues, reserves, and assessments (provided by the City) are included as Exhibit B hereto.

Annual Cost Indexing

With the passage of Proposition 218, any proposed increase in assessments must be placed for approval before the property owners by a mail ballot and a public hearing process, similar to these proceedings. A majority of ballots received must be affirmative for the

City Council to confirm and levy the increased assessments. For small assessment districts or districts with relatively low dollar assessments, the cost of an engineer's report, balloting, and the public hearing process can potentially exceed the total cost of the increase. These incidental costs of the proceedings can be added to the assessments, resulting in even higher assessments.

Indexing assessments annually to the San Diego Consumer Price Index for Urban Consumers (SDCPI-U), as approved by the District property owners in Fiscal Year 1998, allows for minor increases for normal maintenance and operating cost escalation without incurring the costs of the Proposition 218 ballot proceedings. Any significant change in the assessment initiated by an increase in service provided or other significant changes to the District would still require the Proposition 218 proceedings and property owner approval.

The maximum authorized assessment established in the Fiscal Year 1998 proceedings are authorized to be indexed (increased or decreased) annually by the factor published in the SDCPI-U. The first year (base year) for indexing to be applied is the first full fiscal year after all landscape maintenance and lighting costs have become the responsibility of the District (i.e., after buildout and the completion of the two-year establishment period).

Future Subdivision & Development Phasing

The Stonecrest Village Master Plan was approved for a maximum 1,235 dwelling units. Due to the nature of the housing market, master-planned developments (such as Stonecrest Village) need flexibility to accommodate market demands. The Tentative Map set maximum densities and dwelling units allowed per planning area or lot. However, the conditions of approval allow for transfer of densities from one planning area or lot to another as development occurs.

At the time of District formation, the number of dwelling units and the type of dwelling units (i.e., apartments, condominiums, townhomes, detached single family homes) was not fixed. This flexibility affected the apportionment of the assessments in two ways: (1) the actual dwelling units to be assessed could only be estimated, and (2) the estimate of benefit to be received was limited to a macro planning area level analysis rather than a micro individual unit level analysis.

Although a maximum of 1,235 dwelling units were approved, the developer estimated that 940 to 1,050 dwelling units would be built. As such, the Engineer's Report and calculation of the maximum authorized assessment was based on 940 dwelling units.

Phasing of development will cause the annual maintenance cost to the District to increase in several incremental steps as responsibility for maintenance shifts from the developer to the District. Upon completion of the two-year establishment period for the Phase I improvements, the annual cost to the District were estimated to increase to approximately \$145,000. At ultimate buildout, costs are estimated at \$341,350. The exact assessment to be levied each fiscal year will be established annually through a process defined by City ordinance, including a public hearing and a City Council action.

The Engineer's Report established a methodology which accommodates the variable nature of development and enables annual assessments to be calculated for any combination of dwelling units constructed or any annual maintenance cost incurred. However, if the maximum authorized assessment per equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) established in the Engineer's Report is exceeded, a ballot of the owners will be required in accordance with Proposition 218.

Method of Apportionment

The benefits associated with the various improvements were defined and classified as either *uniformly* (equally) beneficial to *all* parcels or *uniquely* beneficial to *specific* parcels (see Table 1). The commonly used Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU) method of proportioning costs has been utilized. This method establishes one classification of parcels at a base value of 1.0 and relates other classifications as a fractional ratio to the base classification.

A factor has been calculated for each planning area to account for and apportion benefits uniquely received by parcels within a specific planning area. This factor, combined with the EDU factor based on land use classification, is utilized to apportion the costs of both uniform and unique benefits in proportion to the estimated benefit received.

Estimated Benefit of the Improvements

All benefits from the improvements are special to this District and are distinct from other parcels in the Kearny Mesa Planning Area and the City of San Diego. As experienced by Carmel Valley, Rancho Bernardo, and other communities, enhanced landscape and lighting have proven to benefit parcels by increasing land values in the communities and creating a sense of community identity and pride. These benefits are experienced by all parcels. However, other benefits can be more directly related to specific parcels. The benefits of District improvements have been defined and summarized in Table 1. The improvements estimated to *uniquely benefit specific parcels* and the respective proportionate costs have been used to calculate a Planning Area Factor.

Planning Area Factor

The Planning Area Factors were determined from a weighted average of all of the uniquely distributed benefits (i.e., those elements estimated to uniquely benefit specific planning areas as shown in Table 1). The resulting factors and a sample calculation can be found on Table 2.

As previously mentioned, development patterns were still in a state of flux at the time the District was formed. As such, the original Planning Area layout may change as development occurs. In the event that one or more of the original Planning Areas are combined with one another, a resultant (weighted) Planning Area Factor will be calculated and employed for assessment apportionment purposes.

Land Use Factor

Land Use Classification Factors were determined by setting a single family detached dwelling at 1.0 EDU and relating other dwelling unit classifications by dwelling unit density, traffic trip generation, population per unit, square footage of floor space per unit, and other considerations. These considerations yield the equivalency factors as shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3: Land Use Factors

Land Use/Zoning	Code	Land Use Factor
Residential – Single Family (detached)	SFD	1.0 per dwelling unit
Residential – Townhouse	TWN	0.8 per dwelling unit
Residential – Condominium	CND	0.7 per dwelling unit
Residential – Multi-Family & Apartment	MFR	0.6 per dwelling unit
Open Space (designated)	OSP	0 per acre
Street/Roadway	STR	0 per acre

Detached single family dwelling units may be sold through a condominium map process rather than through subdivision into individual lots via a final subdivision map process. This event will not cause detached single family dwellings to be classified as a condominium for Land Use Factor purposes.

Converting apartments to condominiums will initiate a change in land use classification, increasing the assessment per unit by the respective Land Use Factors (i.e., from 0.6 EDUs to 0.7 EDUs). The sale of any such apartment unit prior to July 1 of a given year will trigger a change in land use classification for the entire building for the following fiscal year assessment.

Sample Assessment Calculations

Following are four sample assessment calculations demonstrating the method of calculation and the effect of the land use and planning area factors in achieving an assessment amount for an individual dwelling unit. The fourth example demonstrates the effect of the cost indexing.

Sample Calculation #1: calculates the maximum assessment for an attached condominium in Planning Area 2C.

Land Use Factor	x	Planning Area Factor (Table 2)	=	EDUs	x	Maximum Authorized Assessment Per EDU (\$402.39*)	=	Total Maximum Authorized Assessment
0.7	x	1.06	=	0.74	x	\$402.39	=	\$298.57

* Subject to cost indexing.

Sample Calculation #2: calculates the maximum assessment for a detached single family dwelling in Planning Area 3A.

Land Use Factor	x	Planning Area Factor (Table 2)	=	EDUs	x	Maximum Authorized Assessment Per EDU (\$402.39*)	=	Total Maximum Authorized Assessment
1.0	x	1.11	=	1.11	x	\$402.39	=	\$446.65

* Subject to cost indexing.

Sample Calculation #3: calculates the assessment for a detached single family dwelling in Planning Area 3A (as does the sample calculation above) for an annual district maintenance cost after buildout of \$323,000 (assumed) and that development occurred such that 931.2 EDUs (assumed) were generated.

$\$323,000 \text{ (cost)} \div 931.2 \text{ (EDUs)} = \$346.86 \text{ assessment per EDU.}$

Land Use Factor	x	Planning Area Factor (Table 2)	=	EDUs	x	Annual Assessment Per EDU (\$346.86)	=	Total Assessment
1.0	x	1.11	=	1.11	x	\$346.86	=	\$385.02

Sample Calculation #4: calculates the annual assessment for a detached single family dwelling in Planning Area 3A (as do the two previous sample calculations above) for a District maintenance cost which exceeds the maximum estimated cost after buildout with a 3.1% cost indexing increase for the previous year applied to the maintenance costs, and 848.3 EDU constructed as estimated.

Estimated annual maintenance cost: \$351,250

Maximum cost for the base year: \$341,350

CPI-U Cost Index for previous year: 3.1%

$\$341,350 \times 1.031 \text{ (3.1\% increase)} = \$351,932$

$\$351,250 \text{ (cost)} \div 848.3 \text{ (EDUs)} = \$414.06 \text{ assessment per EDU}$

Land Use Factor	x	Planning Area Factor (Table 2)	=	EDUs	x	Annual Assessment Per EDU (\$414.06)	=	Total Assessment
1.0	x	1.11	=	1.11	x	\$414.06	=	\$459.61

Summary Results

The District Boundary is presented in Exhibit A.

An estimate of the costs of the improvements provided by the District is included as Exhibit B to this report.

The assessment methodology utilized is as described in the text of this report. Based on this methodology, the EDUs and Fiscal Year 2003 District assessment for each parcel were calculated and are shown in the Assessment Roll (Exhibit C).

Each lot or parcel of land within the District has been identified by unique County Assessor's Parcel Number on the Assessment Roll and the Boundary Map and Assessment Diagram referenced herein. The net assessment for each parcel for Fiscal Year 2003 can be found on the Assessment Roll.

This report has been prepared and respectfully submitted by:

BOYLE ENGINEERING CORPORATION

Eugene F. Shank, PE C 52792

David R. Spencer, EIT CA 109078

I, _____, as CITY CLERK of the CITY OF SAN DIEGO, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, do hereby certify that the Assessment as shown on the Assessment Roll, together with the Assessment Diagram, both of which are incorporated into this report, were filed in my office on the _____ day of _____, 2002.

Charles G. Abdelnour, CITY CLERK
CITY OF SAN DIEGO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

I, _____, as CITY CLERK of the CITY OF SAN DIEGO, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, do hereby certify that the foregoing Assessment, together with the assessment diagram incorporated into this report, was approved and confirmed by the CITY COUNCIL of said City on the _____ day of _____, 2002.

Charles G. Abdelnour, CITY CLERK
CITY OF SAN DIEGO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

I, _____, as SUPERINTENDENT OF STREETS of the CITY OF SAN DIEGO, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, do hereby certify that the foregoing Assessment, together with the assessment diagram was recorded in my office on the _____ day of _____, 2002.

SUPERINTENDENT OF STREETS
CITY OF SAN DIEGO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

TABLE 1 - Benefit Distribution Methodology
Stonecrest Village Maintenance Assessment District

Maintenance Element ⁽¹⁾	Benefit	Weight	Distribution of Benefit	Apportionment
A. Landscaped Medians	Visual Aesthetics	100%	UNIQUE (to Specific Parcels)	Distributed among Planning Areas according to length of access route. ⁽²⁾
B. Landscaped Parkways	Visual Aesthetics	100%	UNIQUE (to Specific Parcels)	Distributed among Planning Areas according to length of access route. ⁽²⁾
C. Landscaped & Hardscaped Paseos	Pedestrian Access	50%	UNIFORM (to All Parcels)	Distributed uniformly based on EDUs.
	Fire Access	50%	UNIFORM (to All Parcels)	Distributed uniformly based on EDUs.
D. Riparian Trail	Visual Aesthetics	33%	UNIFORM (to All Parcels)	Distributed uniformly based on EDUs.
	Viewshed	33%	UNIQUE (to Specific Parcels)	Distributed among Planning Areas according to frontage length. ⁽³⁾
	Recreation	33%	UNIFORM (to All Parcels)	Distributed uniformly based on EDUs.
E. Open Space (native vegetation)	Safety	25%	UNIFORM (to All Parcels)	Distributed uniformly based on EDUs.
	Visual Aesthetics	25%	UNIFORM (to All Parcels)	Distributed uniformly based on EDUs.
	Viewshed	25%	UNIQUE (to Specific Parcels)	Distributed among Planning Areas according to frontage length. ⁽³⁾
	Solar Access	25%	UNIQUE (to Specific Parcels)	Distributed among Planning Areas according to frontage length. ⁽³⁾
F. Landscaped & Irrigated Slopes	Visual Aesthetics	33%	UNIFORM (to All Parcels)	Distributed uniformly based on EDUs.
	Viewshed	33%	UNIQUE (to Specific Parcels)	Distributed among Planning Areas according to frontage area. ⁽⁴⁾
	Slope Stability/Erosion Control	33%	UNIQUE (to Specific Parcels)	Distributed among Planning Areas according to frontage area. ⁽⁴⁾
G. Streetscapes	Visual Aesthetics	100%	UNIQUE (to Specific Parcels)	Distributed among Planning Areas according to frontage length. ⁽³⁾
H. Project Entries	Visual Aesthetics	100%	UNIFORM (to All Parcels)	Distributed uniformly based on EDUs.
I. Lighting	Safety	100%	UNIFORM (to All Parcels)	Distributed uniformly based on EDUs.

⁽¹⁾ Refer to Figure 1 for Maintenance Element location and description.

⁽²⁾ Access route refers to traveled way from Project Entries to Planning Area.

⁽³⁾ Frontage length refers to lineal feet of Planning Area contiguous to Maintenance Element.

⁽⁴⁾ Frontage area refers to area of Maintenance Element contiguous to Planning Area (measured perpendicular to lot line).

TABLE 2 - Planning Area Factor Calculation
Stonecrest Village Maintenance Assessment District

Maintenance Element ⁽¹⁾	Total Annual Cost	% of Total Cost ⁽²⁾	DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFIT				ALLOCATION LENGTH/AREA & DISTRIBUTED COST BY PLANNING AREA ⁽⁵⁾											
			Uniform Amount ⁽³⁾	% of Total	Unique Amount ⁽⁴⁾	% of Total	2A	2B	2C	3A	4A	4B	7	9	10A	10B	11	TOTAL
A. Landscaped Medians (LF)	\$50,993	15%	\$27,536	54%	\$23,457	46%	0	0	0	350	350	350	0	350	350	350	350	2,450
							\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,351	\$3,351	\$3,351	\$0	\$3,351	\$3,351	\$3,351	\$3,351	\$23,457
B. Landscaped Parkways (LF)	\$101,985	30%	\$55,072	54%	\$46,913	46%	0	0	0	350	350	925	0	740	1,390	1,640	1,640	7,035
							\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,334	\$2,334	\$6,168	\$0	\$4,935	\$9,269	\$10,936	\$10,936	\$46,913
C. Landscaped & Hardscaped Paseos	\$0	0%	\$0	100%	\$0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
							\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
D. Riparian Trail (LF)	\$50,993	15%	\$33,995	67%	\$16,998	33%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,235	740	410	840	0	3,225
							\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,509	\$3,900	\$2,161	\$4,427	\$0	\$16,998
E. Open Space (native vegetation) (LF)	\$16,998	5%	\$8,499	50%	\$8,499	50%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,235	740	410	840	480	3,705
							\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,833	\$1,698	\$941	\$1,927	\$1,101	\$8,499
F. Landscaped & Irrigated Slopes (acres)	\$84,988	25%	\$28,329	33%	\$56,659	67%	0.00	0.52	1.72	2.65	1.75	1.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.38	13.78
							\$0	\$2,138	\$7,072	\$10,896	\$7,195	\$7,237	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$22,121	\$56,659
G. Streetscapes (LF)	\$16,998	5%	\$0	0%	\$16,998	100%	385	385	385	285	285	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,725
							\$3,794	\$3,794	\$3,794	\$2,808	\$2,808	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$16,998
H. Project Entries	\$16,995	5%	\$16,995	100%	\$0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
							\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
I. Lighting	\$1,400	-	\$1,400	100%	\$0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
							\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

TOTAL	\$341,350	100%	\$171,827	-	\$169,523	-	\$3,794	\$5,932	\$10,866	\$19,389	\$15,689	\$16,756	\$9,342	\$13,883	\$15,722	\$20,642	\$37,509	\$169,523
--------------	------------------	-------------	------------------	----------	------------------	----------	----------------	----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	------------------

PLANNING AREA FACTOR	1.02	1.03	1.06	1.11	1.09	1.10	1.05	1.08	1.09	1.12	1.22
-----------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

⁽¹⁾ Refer to Figure 1 for Maintenance Element location and description.

⁽²⁾ Excludes cost of Lighting Maintenance Element.

⁽³⁾ Benefit amount uniform to all parcels (see Table 1).

⁽⁴⁾ Benefit amount unique to specific parcels (see Table 1).

⁽⁵⁾ Planning Areas from Stonecrest Village Master Tentative Map dated 7/19/96.

SAMPLE CALCULATION

(Example: for Planning Area 2A)

$$\text{Planning Area Factor} = \frac{(\text{Total Uniform Cost} + \text{Total Planning Area Distributed Cost})}{\text{Total Uniform Cost}}$$

$$\text{Planning Area Factor} = \frac{(\$171,827 + \$3,794)}{\$171,827} = 1.02$$

**LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE DISTRICT
MAINTAINED AREAS LEGEND**

- (A) MEDIANS (STONECREST, DALEY CENTER DRIVE AND WEST CANYON AVENUE)**
HANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC CLEANING OF MEDIAN MAINTENANCE STRIP
IRRIGATION MAINTENANCE: WATER MANAGEMENT, ROUTINE MAINTENANCE
SHRUB MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC PRUNING AND FERTILIZING
TREE MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC CANOPY PRUNING AND FERTILIZING
- (B) PARKWAYS (STONECREST, WEST CANYON AVENUE AND DALEY CENTER DRIVE)**
HANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC CLEANING OF SIDEWALKS
IRRIGATION MAINTENANCE: WATER MANAGEMENT, ROUTINE MAINTENANCE
SHRUB MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC PRUNING AND FERTILIZING
TREE MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC CANOPY PRUNING, ROOT PRUNING AND FERTILIZING
NOTE: AND WILL MAINTAIN THE CURB ADVANCED PARALLEL TO SIDEWALK IN FRONT OF THE NEW OCCUPANCY CENTER OF STONECREST STREET CANYON. THE MASTER ADA WILL MAINTAIN THE PLANTING AREA BEHIND THE SIDEWALK.
- (C) PASEOS**
HANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC CLEANING OF PAVED PAVING
IRRIGATION MAINTENANCE: WATER MANAGEMENT, ROUTINE MAINTENANCE
SHRUB MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC PRUNING AND FERTILIZING
TREE MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC CANOPY PRUNING, ROOT PRUNING AND FERTILIZING
TURF MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC MOWING, EDGING AND FERTILIZING
- (D) RIPARIAN TRAIL**
HANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC CLEANING OF ASPHALT RIPARIAN TRAIL
IRRIGATION MAINTENANCE: WATER MANAGEMENT, ROUTINE MAINTENANCE
SHRUB MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC PRUNING AND FERTILIZING
TREE MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC CANOPY PRUNING AND FERTILIZING
- (E) OPEN SPACE**
GENERAL MAINTENANCE: GENERAL CLEAN-UP
EXCLUSIONS: BRUSH MANAGEMENT PRUNING AND THINNING ZONE TO BE MAINTAINED BY MASTER ADA
- (F) SLOPES**
IRRIGATION MAINTENANCE: WATER MANAGEMENT, ROUTINE MAINTENANCE
SHRUB MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC PRUNING AND FERTILIZING
TREE MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC CANOPY PRUNING AND FERTILIZING
- (G) STREETSCAPES**
HANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC CLEANING OF SIDEWALKS
IRRIGATION MAINTENANCE: WATER MANAGEMENT, ROUTINE MAINTENANCE
SHRUB MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC PRUNING AND FERTILIZING
TREE MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC CANOPY PRUNING, ROOT PRUNING AND FERTILIZING
TURF MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC MOWING, EDGING AND FERTILIZING
- (H) PROJECT ENTRIES**
HANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC CLEANING OF SIDEWALKS & ENHANCED PAVING
IRRIGATION MAINTENANCE: WATER MANAGEMENT, ROUTINE MAINTENANCE
SHRUB MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC PRUNING AND FERTILIZING
TREE MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC CANOPY PRUNING, ROOT PRUNING AND FERTILIZING
TURF MAINTENANCE: PERIODIC MOWING, EDGING AND FERTILIZING
EXCLUSIONS: ENTRY MONUMENT WALLS AND FIDELISTARIN STRUCTURES
- (I) STREET LIGHTS**





EXHIBIT A

STONECREST VILLAGE LANDSCAPE & LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT

BOUNDARY MAP



LEGEND

- ASSESSMENT DISTRICT BOUNDARY
- - - - FUTURE LOT LINE

Scale: 1 in = 500 ft

Filed in the Office of the City Clerk of the City of San Diego, State of California, this _____ day of _____, 1997.

CHARLES G. ABDELNOUR, CITY CLERK
CITY OF SAN DIEGO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

I hereby certify that the within map showing proposed boundaries of Stonecrest Village Landscape & Lighting Maintenance District, City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, was approved by the City Council at a regular meeting thereof, held on the _____ day of _____, 1997, by its Resolution No. _____.

CHARLES G. ABDELNOUR, CITY CLERK
CITY OF SAN DIEGO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA




EXHIBIT B

EXHIBIT B - Estimated Annual Expenses, Revenues & Reserves
Stonecrest Village Maintenance Assessment District

DESCRIPTION	FUND		FY 2003 ⁽¹⁾
	OPERATIONS	RESERVE	TOTAL
BEGINNING FUND BALANCE	\$0.00	\$313,961.00	\$313,961.00
REVENUE:			
District Assessments	\$252,099.00	\$0.00	\$252,099.00
Interest	\$0.00	\$3,241.00	\$3,241.00
City Contribution:			
Environmental Growth Fund	\$1,643.00	\$0.00	\$1,643.00
Gas Tax Fund	\$3,610.00	\$0.00	\$3,610.00
TOTAL REVENUE	\$257,352.00	\$3,241.00	\$260,593.00
TRANSFER FROM RESERVE	\$169,271.00	(\$169,271.00)	\$0.00
TOTAL CASH AVAILABLE	\$426,623.00	\$147,931.00	\$574,554.00
EXPENSE:			
Personnel	\$56,134.00	\$0.00	\$56,134.00
Contractual	\$275,000.00	\$0.00	\$275,000.00
Incidental	\$36,729.00	\$0.00	\$36,729.00
Utilities	\$58,760.00	\$0.00	\$58,760.00
TOTAL EXPENSE	\$426,623.00	\$0.00	\$426,623.00
ENDING FUND BALANCE	\$0.00	\$147,931.00	\$147,931.00

⁽¹⁾ FY 2003 is the City's Fiscal Year 2003, which begins July 1, 2002 and ends June 30, 2003.

EXHIBIT C

ENGINEER'S REPORT ASSESSMENT ROLL

The undersigned, pursuant to the "Maintenance Assessment Districts Ordinance" (Division 2, Article 5, Chapter VI beginning at Section 65.0201 of the San Diego Municipal Code), the "Landscape and Lighting Act of 1972" (Part 2, Division 15 of the California Streets and Highways Code), applicable provisions of "Proposition 218" (Article XIID of the California Constitution), and the "Proposition 218 Omnibus Implementation Act" (California Senate Bill 919) (the aforementioned provisions are hereinafter referred to collectively as "Assessment Law"), does hereby submit the following:

1. Pursuant to the provisions of Assessment Law and the Resolution of Intention, we have assessed the costs and expenses of the works of improvement (maintenance) to be performed in the Assessment District upon the parcels of land in the Assessment District benefited thereby in direct proportion and relation to the estimated benefits to be received by each of said parcels. For particulars as to the identification of said parcels, reference is made to the Assessment Diagram and Boundary Map on file in the Maintenance Assessment Districts section of the Park and Recreation Department of the City of San Diego. A copy of the Boundary Map is included in the Engineer's Report as Exhibit A.
2. The Assessment Diagram included in this report shows the Assessment District, as well as the boundaries and dimensions of the respective parcels and subdivisions of land within the Assessment District, the same as existed at the time of the passage of the Resolution of Intention, each of which subdivisions of land or parcels or lots respectively have been given a separate number upon the Assessment Diagram and in the Assessment Roll (Exhibit C).
3. By virtue of the authority contained in said Assessment Law, and by further direction and order of the legislative body, we hereby make the following assessment to cover the costs and expenses of the works of improvement (maintenance) for the Assessment District based on the costs and expenses as set forth in the Engineer's Report.

For particulars as to the individual assessments and their descriptions, reference is made to the Assessment Roll (Exhibit C) attached hereto.

DATED: _____, 2002

BOYLE ENGINEERING CORPORATION

By: _____
Eugene F. Shank, PE C 52792

By: _____
David R. Spencer, EIT CA 109078